

# **REQUESTS TO BE HEARD**

**28 June 2022**

**Council Meeting**

# Council Meeting

28 June 2022

## Requests to be Heard

<b>Item 10.2</b>		<b>For (F) Against (A)</b>
<b>2022–23 Budget and 2022–23 to 2031–32 Financial Plan</b>		
<b>Written Statements</b>		<b>Page 5</b>
1.	Mr George Reynolds (on behalf of Bayside Residents Group - Ratepayers Victoria Inc.)	(A)
2.	Mr Fraser Gibson (on behalf of Petitioners and supporters of Shared paths Cheltenham, Southland, Hightett)	(A)
<b>Requests to Speak</b>		
1.	Mr George Reynolds (on behalf of Bayside Residents Group - Ratepayers Victoria Inc.)	(A)

<b>Item 10.4</b>		<b>For (F) Against (A)</b>
<b>Warm Water Pool and Wellness Centre - Stage 1 Community Engagement Findings</b>		
<b>Written Statements</b>		<b>Page 10</b>
1.	Ms Michelle Bentley (on behalf of Bayside Seniors Action Group)	(F)
2.	Mrs Dineke McLean (on behalf of Bayside Seniors Action Group)	(F)
<b>Requests to Speak</b>		
1.	Dr Timothy O'Shannassay	(A)
2.	Mr Dirk Gierlach	(A)

<b>Item 10.7</b>		<b>For (F) Against (A)</b>
<b>Urban Forest Strategy 2022 - Implementation Update</b>		
<b>Written Statements</b>		<b>Page 14</b>
1.	Mr Derek Screen (on behalf of Pennydale Residents Action Group Inc.)	(F)

<b>Item 10.10</b>		<b>For (F) Against (A)</b>
<b>General Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Character Review Update</b>		
<b>Written Statements</b>		<b>Page 17</b>
1.	Mr Derek Screen (on behalf of Pennydale Residents Action Group Inc.)	(F)

<b>Item 10.15</b>		<b>For (F) Against (A)</b>
<b>Process for Street Closure and Consideration of Trader Permit Parking</b>		
<b>Written Statements</b>		<b>Page 20</b>
1.	Mr Erik Purcell	(F)
2.	Ms Nina Sharpe	(F)
3.	Mr Ray Purcell	(F)

# **WRITTEN STATEMENTS**

**Item 10.2**

**2022–23 Budget and 2022–23 to 2031–32  
Financial Plan**

1.	<b>Mr George Reynolds (on behalf of Bayside Residents Group - Ratepayers Victoria Inc.)</b>	<b>(A)</b>
----	---	------------

Bayside City Council Meeting. June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

Agenda Item 10.2 Budget 2022-23.

HAVE YOUR SAY.

Councillors, Your Budget is seriously defective. While the plans are grand and expensive, the associated financial provisions are inadequate and unjustified. The financial statements shown on pages 36 – 71 in the document “Annual Budget 2022/23” fails to meet the basic requirements of the Local Government Model Financial Report (LGMFR), the Australian Accounting Standards (AAS). The Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2020 (S.R.117/2020) and the Corporations Law (Part 2M3). Compliance issues are listed below.

1. **Subordinate Legislation.** Page 5 of the Local Government Better Practice Guide 2014-15 lists, as a guiding principle “In the event of any conflict between the requirements of the LGMFR and the requirements of the AAS, the requirements of the AAS take precedence.
2. **Comprehensive Income Statement (CIS),** page 36, shows income and expenditure as an aggregate of entries from different functions and entries of different nature. The expenditure related to general rates, municipal charges, waste service charges and Own source Revenue (Council’s Beneficial Enterprises), is aggregated into a single stream. This is non-compliance with AASB 101.29, LGMFR G22, and S.R. 117/2020.
3. While the income and expenditure related to **Own source Revenue** is included as part of the CIS aggregation, it is not separately shown as the income and expenditure related to Council’s Corporate Entity. The non-compliance is in ignoring the requirements of (Part 2M3) of Corporations Law and LGA 2020 s111(2).
4. **The CIS is defective** as it mixes capital revenue and operating revenue and both capital and operating expenditure in a single statement. It also shows the balance sheet value adjustments of depreciation and amortisation, including depreciation of right of use assets, as an expense. It is non-compliant with AASB 101.103, and AASB 116. It is also non-compliant with S.R. 117/2020, s9 and 10, and LGMFR G28 and G29.
5. **Treatment of Surplus Collections.** The aggregation of surplus collections from rates and charges. and that of surplus funds from Own source Revenue, is improper and may be seen as unlawful. General Rates, Municipal Charges and Waste Services charges are non-voluntary contributions which must be held in trust until spent, in the manner set out in AASB 1004 12-19. Such purchase must also provide a benefit to the contributors. The surplus from Own-source Revenue is known as Council Cash. It is the profit equivalent generated from the activities of Council acting as a commercial enterprise (Council has both an ABN and an ACN). To fail to publish an accounting statement is a breach of Part 2M.3 of the Corporation Act. Failure to treat the unspent rates and charges as trust funds is a failure to comply with AASB 1004 12-19.
6. **Accounting for Capital Works.** To comply with Part 3, s10(1) of SR117/2020, Council must show separately the source of funds classified as grants, contributions, Council cash, and borrowings. Borrowings and contributions ( e.g. Special Rates per s163, LGA 1989) must be asset specific. Hence a separate Capital Works statement, for each revenue stream, must be prepared. The aggregation of the Source of Funds is shown in Section 4.5 Capital Works Program, (p62-70) of the Budget Document. It is particularly noticeable that the dominant source of capital is Council Cash. As the only source of Council Cash is the surplus generated from (the unaccounted) Own-source Revenue, Council cash becomes a mythical quantity.

There are many other failures that render the accounts unusable. Of particular note, the capital expenditure planned for the Netball Courts in Holloway Road. This capital is unlikely to be expended in 2021-22 yet there is no provision for the venture to be carried forward into 2023. Attached is the CIS, adjusted into separate functions and by nature of expenditure.

CIS segregated by Function and Nature. In \$'000		Bayside City Council – Budget for 2021 – 22. Adjusted Comprehensive Income Statement (CIS)				Format adjusted to comply with AASB 101.29.	
Entry \ Source of Revenue	General Rates	Municipal Charge	Waste Charge	Own Source Revenue	TOTAL INCOME	CAPITAL WORKS	VALUATION CHANGE
Revenue.					108,401		
Rates & Charges	84,250	7,639	16,512				
Statutory Fees & Fines				8,663			
User fees				8,933			
Grants – Operating				15,046			
Grants – Capital						4,350	
Contributions - Monetary- Operating				102			
Contributions - Monetary – Capital						3,650	
Contributions - non-Monetary Capital							000
Rental Income				3,966			
Interest Income				955			
Other Income				1,487	39,152	XXXX	
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>81416</b>	<b>7487</b>	<b>14654</b>	<b>34970</b>	<b>147,553</b>	<b>8,000+XXXX</b>	
Expenses							
Employee costs	PPPP	QQQQ	RRRR	SSSS	(53,081)	TTTT	
Materials and services	pppp	qqqq	rrrr	ssss	(56,123)	tttt	
Depreciation							(23,295)
Amortisation – intangibles							(534)
Amortisation – right of use assets							(1,721)
Bad and doubtful debts				(839)			
Finance costs – leases				(61)			
Other expenses				(506)			
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>pp+PP</b>	<b>QQ+qq</b>	<b>rr+RR</b>	<b>SS+ss+ 1406</b>	<b>(109,204)</b>	<b>tt+TT</b>	<b>(25,550)</b>
<b>SURPLUS REVENUE (Held in trust)</b>	<b>YYYY</b>	<b>YYYY</b>	<b>YYYY</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>YYYY</b>		<b>136160</b>
<b>EARNINGS BEFORE TAX (Council Cash)</b>					<b>XXXX</b>		

#### Explanation of entries.

1. Where sufficient information is unavailable, numbers are replaced by letters.
2. Surplus Revenue from rates and charges, designated YYYY, must be reported as required by SR 117/2020 in Part 4 s14 1(b).
3. Council Cash, designated by XXXX, is also shown as revenue used to purchase capital goods. However, information is unavailable to separate by function.

#### Example of Significant Omission – Bayside Netball Courts.

1. This venture was part of the 2021-22 budget at a cost of \$15.050M, 100% funded by Council Cash.
2. No discernable work was carried out during 2021-22. There is no mention of this venture in Table 4.5.3 on page 69. (Works carried forward)
3. Reference to the 2021 – 22 budget Capital Works statement (page 37) show it listed as “Asset Contributions”.
4. The entry in 3 above indicates that Council is arranging for Right of Use Assets to be constructed on its behalf. The requirements of AASB 15 and 16 apply.
5. The transfer of assets, without monetary consideration, from tenant to landlord, can only be a Beneficial Enterprise. The provisions of LGA2020 Part 5 Division 3 ss110 and 111 apply. The provisions of s103(f) may also apply.
6. The transaction, when classified as a Council investment, where the benefit is to be received by Council, requires a sub-tenant able to pay a rent, sufficient to eliminate the risk exposure, as required by s111(1)(a) of LGA 2020. The sub-tenant has not been arranged, nor the benefit and liabilities of the tenancy included in the budget.
7. There is no provision made, in the budget accounts, to supply the necessary funds, designated as XXXX, in the Capital Works statement shown in the Adjusted Comprehensive Income Statement (ACIS) on page 2.

As a note to point 7 above, the Source of Funds document on page 57 of the financial statements shows a requirement of \$71.726M to fund the full Capital Works requirement. In the ACIS, the entry marked XXXX, in the Capital Works column, should be \$72.726M. However, the entry marked XXXX, shown in the Council Cash (generated) line, must be equal to or greater than, \$72.726M. Because the required accounting statements have not been prepared, the two entries marked XXXX cannot be reconciled. A CORRECTLY PREPARED CIS WOULD CLEARLY SHOW THE SOURCE OF THE REQUIRED CAPITAL FUNDS.S.

#### Summary of Submission.

The submission lists significant errors and omissions in the preparation of Council’s financial statements. The most significant omission is the absence of Own-source Revenue (OSR) statements, which properly account for both Capital and Income. Item 7 (above) demonstrates how the absence of an auditable OSR is sufficient to render this budget invalid. The failure to provide an OSR is a failure to comply with Commonwealth Law – the Corporations Law. George Reynolds, Coordinator, Bayside Ratepayers Group, Ratepayers Viuctoria.

<b>2. Mr Fraser Gibson (on behalf of Petitioners and supporters of Shared paths Cheltenham, Southland, Hightett)</b>	<b>(A)</b>
--	------------

Dear Councillors,

I refer to Agenda item 10.2 22/23 Budget - Capital works -Other infrastructure Page 68.

**1) Bike paths New/Upgrade -Route connecting Cheltenham and Sandringham \$208k**

If Council are committed to this vital safe and convenient shared path for all abilities connecting activity centres, residential areas, schools, Tulip Street recreation centre, Golf courses, Council offices and reserves a realistic budget of \$2-3m or as estimated by Council infrastructure engineering is essential.

Council accepted our 2020 petition on this matter in Feb 2021, allocated \$35k and completed route planning and consultation with Dept. of Transport in 2021. Multiple letters to Councillors and infrastructure from BCCAG, supporters and myself on behalf of petitions requested a \$3m budget for 2021/22, and were assured the Shared Use Path project would proceed and adequate funding would be provided.

Key SUP's shared zones and paths to be included in the Budget include:

2)Path/s from the **Hightett residential areas through Lyle Anderson Reserve** with a tunnel or crossing to the SUP on the rail corridor and Sir Williams Fry Reserve, providing safe convenient access to stations and Southland.

3) From the **Jacks Road crossing through Olympic way and Heather Grove** for safe convenient access from residential areas including the Mirvac residential project and Cheltenham business district to the rail corridor and activity centres.

We now know SRLA Cheltenham project will not fund or be responsible for any Roads, Cycle or Pedestrian paths beyond the proposed station footprint and bridge to Southland station. All Shared paths, zones, cycle and pedestrian ways for the entire 1.6km precinct radius around the proposed station will be up to Councils and Dept. of Transport. Council needs to work with Kingston to publish route plans for these paths and gauge community response through a comprehensive "have your say" questionnaire by August 2022, when the likely hood and extent of SRLA will be clear.

Whether SRLA proceeds or not the above 3 projects are the minimum Bayside council needs to plan and implement to ensure the transition to "Active transport" connections for all abilities to Activity Centres and public transport to reduce congestion, pollution, emissions, car parking etc. These actions are in accordance with the Climate Emergency Plan- Move to Zero carbon Transport emissions and the Integrated Transport Strategy 2018-2028



Fraser Gibson MIE(Aust) (Ret)

CC Petitioners and Chelt.to Sandy supporters

## **Item 10.4**

### **Warm Water Pool and Wellness Centre - Stage 1 Community Engagement Findings**

1.	<b>Ms Michelle Bentley (on behalf of Bayside Seniors Action Group)</b>	<b>(F)</b>
<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors</p> <p>Thank you for your ongoing support for the Warm Water Pool project. Bayside Seniors Action Group is pleased to see that officers have recommended continuing on to the next stage.</p> <p>The consultation process results indicate that respondents were confused between the 2 projects being advertised together. We feel the community support for the WWP project would have been even more fulsome if each project had been conducted as separate consultations.</p> <p>Members at the recent BHARG meeting of the 20th June were concerned when discussing issues which have been experienced at the recently completed WWP at the Danny Frawley Centre in Moorabbin. These appear to be the result of a physiotherapist not being involved in the design process. These include poor orientation to cold prevailing winds, resulting in cool water and air temperatures (this also means higher energy consumption and a poorer environmental outcome); lack of handrails in the pool; a paucity of change/shower rooms close to the pool; a lack of seating/benches near the pool.</p> <p>BHARG members strongly recommended that a physiotherapist who is very well experienced in warm water therapies such as hydrotherapy, be included in the design process.</p> <p>I have had discussions with BSAG members about this issue and they are keen to support BHARG's recommendation.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>		

2.	<b>Mrs Dineke McLean (on behalf of Bayside Seniors Action Group)</b>	<b>(F)</b>
<p>“We are very happy that the community consultations confirm the importance of a warm water/hydro pool for Bayside residents.</p> <p>We are also very happy that the project will be progressed quickly.</p> <p>We note that older residents are particularly supportive of the warm water pool, which confirms comments made to Council by BHARG and BSAG.</p> <p>In December 2021 Council agreed that providing affordable and accessible community access to both Warm Water pools was a key principle of this project. Our concern was particularly in relation to the small warm water pool.</p> <p>So on behalf of the community we represent, we hope that Councillors will be particularly mindful of the need for good public access to the small warm water pool as this project progresses.</p> <p>It is essential that ordinary residents of Bayside have good access to the small warm water pool. This is because a small pool of 34 degrees with a low ceiling (resulting in warm ambient temperature within the room) and limited noise and draught provides the environment necessary for therapeutic healing and exercise for those with chronic conditions.</p> <p>These people do not need to be supervised by physiotherapists, as they can perform their exercises alone.</p> <p>Recently many of us have experienced the newly completed smaller Danny Frawly warm water pool and are dismayed at the poor design and impractical amenities and implore the council to engage an experienced warm water physiotherapist during the design process to ensure Bayside’s small warm water pool is fit for purpose.</p> <p>To this end a document has been compiled detailing optimal requirements and reasons thereof as perceived by those of us who have many years experience of hydrotherapy in different venues. This document has already been lodged with Adam McSwain, Director, Environment, Recreation and Infrastructure, Joan Andrews, Manager, Community Services, Judy Page, Healthy Aging Officer and of course Sara Townsend, Recreation Projects Coordinator. We would be happy to send a copy to interested Councillors.</p> <p>The larger pool will not serve our purpose, as any pool engaging in learn to swim classes and other exercise will necessarily not maintain the same pool temperature, overall ambient air temperature and noise control that a small therapeutic warm water pool provides.</p> <p>This is borne out by the way in which GESAC, PARC and Monash (Glen Waverly) aquatic centre use their warm water pools.</p>		

We note that physiotherapists require the same conditions which ordinary individuals need to achieve therapeutic results, which is why it seems they do not wish to use the larger warm water pool.

We believe that individual residents using the small pool will not conflict with physiotherapists using that small pool also.

Ordinary senior residents usually prefer to access the small pool on weekdays between 10am and 3.30pm. Previous Council papers suggest physiotherapists prefer the times from 4pm to later in the day, and in the early morning, when workers and students can access their services.

We therefore ask Councillors to continue to require, as a matter of priority, good access by ordinary residents to the small warm water pool.

Thank you for your consideration. “

**Item 10.7**

**Urban Forest Strategy 2022  
- Implementation Update**

1.	<b>Mr Derek Screen (on behalf of Pennydale Residents Action Group Inc.)</b>	<b>(F)</b>
----	---	------------

Dear Councillors,

As you would know, the Pennydale Residents Action Group (Inc) and the Pennydale residents themselves are a huge supporter of the Urban Forest Strategy, having input into this process since its beginning, and we are fully behind the strategy itself and what it intends to do and we comment both Bayside Council and its Officers who have been involved in this work so far.

We are very happy to see tonight that the strategy sees its implementation update and that Council has committed \$508,000 of Council funds in the first year of its operation, but we are still quite concerned that Pennydale has not been looked at as an URGENT need because of its unique position in the municipality and this is causing great concern amongst our community.

It is without debate that Pennydale is the HIGHEST density residential area in all of Bayside, Pennydale is also the LOWEST residential area for canopy tree coverage and at the same time Pennydale is sandwiched between the Bayside business district and Southland Shopping centre contributing to what is arguably already the HOTTEST residential area as well, yet in tonights documentation Officers have still felt it necessary include Pennydale with the rest of Cheltenham in the annual reporting documentation instead of treating it separately because of its UNIQUE circumstances.

Whilst Pennydale is a PART of Cheltenham, to be linked with the rest of Cheltenham with respect to the Urban Forest Strategy is to link Pennydale with 3 Golf Courses, 2 Cemeteries, a Major Urban Parkland, a huge Primary school containing its own enclosed nature sanctuary all containing large amounts of trees AND the majority of the Bayside Business district arguably containing the lowest number of trees. We simply do not fit in with the other sections of Cheltenham when looking through the eyes of this Strategy and we MUST be looked at individually. Even the other residential section of Cheltenham along Charman and Weatherall Roads are different as they are all covered by a VPO as well as a large section covered by Heritage overlay making that residential section of Cheltenham so far removed it doesn't not even begin to resemble Pennydale.

For this strategy to work, all areas need to be looked at singularly and whilst Officers have explained that once implemented, the strategy will look at individual PRECINCTS for specific assistance, this will NOT be seen if Pennydale remains as a component of Cheltenham as a whole.

Pennydale is already behind everyone else in Bayside and we need help NOW. Whilst that help IS coming, and we know we will get our look in through a separate precinct, the BEST way to guarantee that at anytime you, officers, executives and residents can SEE if we are improving or not AT A GLANCE is to separate Pennydale out from Cheltenham and create a separate line in the Annual Report for us. I hasten to add that this should ALSO be done for the Bayside Business District as well because that area too is UNIQUE in its makeup throughout the Municipality, just as Pennydale is for residential areas. If this separation is not done NOW, it will be difficult to do at a later stage, but, more importantly, it will likely mean that Pennydale will drop off the list of importance as Cheltenham overall – through most of its area being covered by a VPO and open space precincts where plantings are and will be easier – will have its figures, good or bad, lost within those Cheltenham figures that will likely put out a false report about how Pennydale is doing. If Pennydale suffers, it WILL spread to those direct neighbours and start bringing them down too as heat knows no borders. If we can SEE what is happening, we can all do something to fix it.

I urge all Councillors to please separate Pennydale from the rest of Cheltenham in the Urban Forest Strategy Annual Reporting documentation and at the same time the Bayside Business district as well, so that we can ALL benefit from this wonderful work.

Many thanks in advance

Derek Screen

President, Pennydale residents Action Group (Inc)

**Item 10.10**

**General Residential Zone, Neighbourhood  
Character Review Update**

1.	<b>Mr Derek Screen (on behalf of Pennydale Residents Action Group Inc.)</b>	<b>(F)</b>
----	---	------------

Dear Councillors,

As with our comments made for the February 15<sup>th</sup> 2022 Council meeting, the Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG) is generally happy with the progression so far for this policy currently under discussion and will continue to work with Council’s Officers to ensure that the issues that Pennydale has pertaining to our Neighbourhood Character, are understood and taken into consideration. We believe Officers have done quite a good job thus far in weighing up the needs of the Neighbourhood Character of the area with the need for increased housing in a growth area, and we believe that that balancing act has been generally well handled and we appreciate the work the officers have to date put into this review.

Having said that, we still feel that there is more that needs to be done due to the unique position Pennydale finds itself in within the Bayside municipality, being already the highest density residential area of all of Bayside as well as being the lowest tree canopy coverage area in all of the municipality, and the problems these are already causing which is exacerbated by the massive hard surfaces caused by both the Bayside Business District to our West and Southland Shopping Centre to our East which is something no other area in Bayside suffers from. As such, and because of these issues which will get more and more concerning as time goes on unless we take actions now, we feel there is still some work to do before this review hits the right spot.

As mentioned in our request to be heard in February, when the State government created and implemented Amendment C180Bays, changing and putting the Neighbourhood Character statements into the Bayside Planning Scheme without Council or the community’s input (the Minister implemented this on his OWN accord), only Pennydale as a residential area missed out on a hugely important line stating “PROTECT THE EXISTING CANOPY COVERAGE”. All other residential neighbourhood character statements added to the Bayside Planning Scheme by the Minister at Clause 15.01-5L had this line in them protecting the rest of the residential areas of Bayside. Pennydale did not. An UPDATE to the Neighbourhood Character statements in the new proposed GRZ9 being put forward by Officers tonight MUST include that line to CORRECT this anomaly now currently in the Planning Scheme and also EXTENDING that line to match those words now also being put into the parent GRZ2 statements that GRZ9 and the others are based around by Officers, words that state “...and to maintain sufficient space around buildings for the retention and planting of substantial vegetation and large canopy trees”, into the GRZ9 schedule itself under the Neighbourhood Character Objectives, to not only match the rest of Bayside, but to guarantee that the existing canopy trees and major vegetation are protected. This will NOT stop future development, but it WILL guarantee that those existing canopy trees will not suffer at the hands of poor design of possible future development.

Further, as well as the above, Bayside Planning Scheme Clause 15.01-5L that was inserted by the Minister using amendment C180Bays must also be amended to insert the same wording otherwise we again left with conflicting texts that can be exploited by developers. This is of course something we do NOT wish to occur and this is something that we do NOT believe is a major ask either, simply bringing Pennydale into line with the rest of residential Bayside.

With Bayside amongst so many other Councils around Australia declaring a Climate Emergency, and with Bayside moving forward just tonight with the Urban Forest Strategy, asking for what should be considered a CORRECTION of an oversight in the big scheme of things for something that aligns with both of these policies – the retention of and

protection of existing canopy trees – should be something all Councillors would I hope agree with, and I ask that Councillors please vote to include these changes into the proposed texts before they approve tonights update. With Climate being such a huge overarching subject that permeates so much of our lives and of course of our laws and policies, we trust all Councillors can see the importance of getting this right now to prevent further loss of canopy trees that can take decades to replace IF there is space left to do so following a development request that may not allow space for a replacement either. We need to keep those canopy trees we currently have and plant more, and if this means developers need to amend plans to keep and make space for trees, then that is the better outcome, not to have an anomaly in the planning scheme that could make it easier for them to remove yet more wonderful trees.

We will of course continue to work with Officers for the benefit of Pennydale as well as the rest of Bayside as well through the next stage of this update.

Many thanks in advance

Derek Screen

President, Pennydale residents Action Group (Inc)

**Item 10.15**

**Process for Street Closure and Consideration  
of Trader Permit Parking**

<b>1. Mr Erik Purcell</b>	<b>(F)</b>
<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>Over the past 12 months there have been two petitions to partially close Melrose Street in Sandringham.</p> <p>The first petition was run in 2021, to permanently retain the extended footpath trading areas, and the existing spacelets in Melrose Street, Sandringham, and to close the East end of Melrose Street. This petition gained 570+ signatures in support of this vision.</p> <p>The second petition has run over the past few months, in support to close Melrose Street in Sandringham, between 12 Melrose Street and 118 – 120 Beach Road, to vehicular traffic. In doing so, this closure would create public place, encouraging community engagement and stimulating business activity within Sandringham Major Activity Centre.</p> <p>So far, this petition has gained 139 signatures. Below is a link of the active e-petition for your viewing of the supporting comments, and signatures.</p> <p><a href="https://www.change.org/p/petition-to-bayside-council-to-partially-close-melrose-street">https://www.change.org/p/petition-to-bayside-council-to-partially-close-melrose-street</a></p> <p>As you can see, there is a clear appetite and support for the partial closure of Melrose Street. The local community and people that visit Sandringham want to see the Village better utilised, and transform it into a hub for activity in Bayside.</p> <p>This beautiful suburb is unique in its location, and is currently being underutilised. The opportunity to create more ‘greenspaces’ and soft landscaping will attract visitors and Bayside residents to Sandringham, for them to enjoy the benefits of public open space within Sandringham Village. We are confident that the creation of this communal open space will give businesses the opportunity to flourish, making Sandringham Station not only the final destination on the train line, but <u>‘The Destination’</u>.</p> <p>Melrose Street has previously been identified as the only location in Bayside that would be able to accommodate a pedestrian friendly strip. This was discussed in 2020 in a presentation made by the Economic Development Team at Bayside Council, and was coined “Melrose Place”.</p> <p>This development can only bring positivity for all stakeholders in Sandringham. We need Bayside Councils help to take action and make our vision a reality. It is time for progression in Sandringham, and act on its potential.</p> <p>Erik Purcell Director / Sidebar.</p>	

<b>2.</b>	<b>Ms Nina Sharpe</b>	<b>(F)</b>
<p>I would like to support item 10.15 of the forthcoming council meeting on 28 June 2022. The move to reduce the traffic access to Sandringham Village and provide green meeting spaces for public and pedestrian use will have a great impact on the way this space is used. It will mark a small move in the right direction to support a reduction in overall emissions and regeneration of Sandringham Village.</p>		

<b>3.</b>	<b>Mr Ray Purcell</b>	<b>(F)</b>
<p>As a Business owner, resident and property owner in Melrose Street Sandringham I personally support the closure of Melrose Street to traffic to enable the creation of green public open space within Sandringham Village. Melrose Street is the gateway into Sandringham Village from the foreshore to the Village Centre and train Station . It's heritage buildings provide the ideal backdrop to public open space. The additional soft landscaping within the Village will add to amenity within the village and increased commercial activity through improved walkability and visitor experience. It will help mitigate urban heating. It will help people feel better within their environment and assist with wellbeing. I would also welcome an examination of additional suitable locations within the Village as part of a " greening up" of the Village.</p>		